

WIS-93/34/Apr-PH
TAUP XXXX-93

A QCD Relation Between Hyperfine Splittings in Isospin doublets A Light Quark Symmetry?

HARRY J. LIPKIN

Department of Nuclear Physics
Weizmann Institute of Science
Rehovot 76100, Israel
and

School of Physics and Astronomy
Raymond and Beverly Sackler Faculty of Exact Sciences
Tel Aviv University
Tel Aviv, Israel
April 19, 1993

ABSTRACT

Recent data on the D^* masses confirm the QCD prediction based on the very general assumption [1] that the spin-dependence of the quark couplings to photons and gluons have the same structure and differ only in the value of the coupling constants. This prediction with no free parameters and using the Ξ and Ξ^* masses as input follows from noting that the charmed antiquark $\bar{c}$ and the strange diquark (ss) have exactly the same couplings to both the photon ($Q=-2/3$) and to the gluon (both are color antitriplets). New predictions are obtained with this approach. Corrections to the naive model are investigated and shown to be small.

Recent very precise measurements of the isospin splittings in the charmed pseudoscalar and vector meson multiplets [2] combined with other experimental masses[3] confirm a nearly model-independent QCD prediction[1],

$$(10.3 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-3} = \frac{\delta m(D) - \delta m(D^*)}{M(D^*) - M(D)} = \frac{\delta m(\Xi) - \delta m(\Xi^*)}{M(\Xi^*) - M(\Xi)} = (15 \pm 4) \times 10^{-3} \quad (1)$$

where $\delta m(h)$ denotes the mass splitting in a given hadron isospin doublet denoted by h . This prediction with no free parameters follows from noting that the charmed antiquark $\bar{c}$ and the strange diquark (ss) have exactly the same couplings to both the photon ($Q=-2/3$) and to the gluon (both are color antitriplets). When a light u or d quark is added to a $\bar{c}$ to make a D or D^* or added to a (ss) pair to make a Ξ or Ξ^* the strong and electromagnetic contributions to the hyperfine splittings have the same ratio in both systems. The hyperfine interaction of both of these systems with an additional light quark thus changes by the same ratio when the light quark flavor is changed from u to d . This spin dependence of hadron isospin mass splittings has been used by Sakharov[4] in the DGG model[5] to obtain an estimate for the ratio α_{strong}/α . It has also been used with new data[6] to obtain meson decay constants.

The above derivation is more general than the previous version[1] which used additional assumptions to treat other hadron masses. Our very general assumption that the spin-dependence of the quark couplings to photons and gluons have the same structure and differ only in the value of the coupling constants can be applied simply to all color singlet hadrons which are bound states of a single u or d quark and some isoscalar combination of quarks or antiquarks denoted by X with electric charge Q_X and spin $S_X \neq 0$ to obtain the relations

$$\frac{\delta m(D) - \delta m(D^*)}{M(D^*) - M(D)} = \frac{\delta m(\Xi) - \delta m(\Xi^*)}{M(\Xi^*) - M(\Xi)} = \frac{\delta m(\Xi_b) - \delta m(\Xi_b^*)}{M(\Xi_b^*) - M(\Xi_b)} \quad (2a)$$

$$\frac{\delta m(K) - \delta m(K^*)}{M(K^*) - M(K)} = \frac{\delta m(B) - \delta m(B^*)}{M(B^*) - M(B)} = \frac{\delta m(\Xi_c) - \delta m(\Xi_c^*)}{M(\Xi_c^*) - M(\Xi_c)} \quad (2b)$$

Until recently the errors on the experimental values of the charmed meson masses were too great to allow a significant test of the prediction (1). With present data the main source of error is seen to arise from Ξ^* masses, not the D^* 's. Although the errors are still large $\approx 30\%$ the agreement is significant. This is seen by noting the very large difference between the ratios (1) and the experimental[3] value $-(7 \pm 3) \times 10^{-3}$ for the analogous ratio (2b) for kaons. This difference is expected since the electric charges of the strange and charmed quarks have opposite signs while the color couplings are the same. Thus the relative signs of the electromagnetic and strong contributions to the hyperfine splittings are opposite in the two cases.

We now examine these relations at a deeper level beginning with the DGG constituent quark model[5] in which the hyperfine interaction has the color-spin properties of one-gluon exchange, is inversely proportional to the product of quark masses and is treated as a first-order perturbation. The most naive version apparently neglects all dependence of hadron wave functions on quark masses and assumes that both hyperfine interactions and quark magnetic moments scale with the same effective mass parameters. Spectacular success has been obtained with this naive approach in using a ratio of roughly 3/2 between effective quark masses of strange and nonstrange quarks to explain the observed ratio of hyperfine splittings between strange and nonstrange mesons and between strange and nonstrange baryons as well as the ratio of Λ and nucleon magnetic moments. [5,7],

$$1.5 = -\frac{\mu_p}{3\mu_\Lambda} = \frac{m_s}{m_u} = 6 \cdot \frac{M(\Lambda) - M(N)}{M(\Delta) + M(N)} + 1 = 1.5 \quad (3a)$$

$$1.5 = \frac{M(\Delta) - M(N)}{M(\Sigma^*) - M(\Sigma)} = \frac{m_s}{m_u} = \frac{M(\rho) - M(\pi)}{M(K^*) - M(K)} = 1.6 \quad (3b)$$

However, the experimental hyperfine splittings in the charmed D mesons do not show this factor 3/2. Experiment gives

$$\frac{m_s}{m_u} = \frac{M(D^*) - M(D)}{M(D_s^*) - M(D_s)} = 1.01 \neq 1.5 \quad (3c)$$

Some insight into this paradox is obtained by noting that increasing a quark mass not only decreases the strength of the hyperfine interaction but also increases the value of the wave function at the origin and therefore increases the matrix element of the interaction. The two effects are in opposite directions and which is dominant is not clear a priori. The result (3c) suggests that the two effects may cancel in the charmed case. But the problem remains why ignoring wave function effects gives such good results in the lighter quark sector. Furthermore this model has as yet no rigorous justification from QCD and the exact meaning of constituent quarks and constituent quark masses remain unclear.

Although detailed models can be constructed to resolve the paradox (3), we consider here only the general derivations and implications of the relations (2) which depend on the very small $u - d$ mass difference. These relations can be reasonably derived by first-order perturbation theory and should provide simpler tests of the underlying dynamical assumptions than other relations connecting states with larger mass differences. We investigate various wave function effects neglected in the simple derivation and note that special problems arise because there are two independent perturbations. Both the hyperfine interaction and the mass difference are assumed to be small. First-order perturbation theory in a single perturbation

automatically takes into account first-order changes in wave functions, and there is danger of double counting if one also includes wave function effects in addition to the normal perturbation results. But with two independent perturbations it is necessary to specify which first order wave function effects are automatically included and which are not.

We first obtain some systematic features of the isospin dependence of hyperfine splittings expressible as inequalities confirmed by the systematics of the experimental data. These follow from the simple assumption that the effect on the wave function is not strong enough to change the sign of the hyperfine splitting. We then show that in a simple constituent quark model the relation (1) is independent of the structure of the diquark. Finally we examine the wave function effects in a consistent double-perturbation framework, discuss their implications for the relations (2), and show that their contribution to (1) is still small, even though they may significantly affect relations like (3).

Using language borrowed from heavy quark symmetry [8], let $(Xq)^*$ and (Xq) denote the two states with “parallel” and “antiparallel” spins of a light quark u or d denoted by q and “isoscalar brown muck” denoted by X . The two states respectively have total angular momentum $S_X + 1/2$ and $S_X - 1/2$. The mass splitting between such a pair of states is assumed in the DGG model[5] to be due to a hyperfine interaction which has contributions both from the strong color interaction and from the electromagnetic interaction. We weaken the DGG assumptions by not necessarily assuming a constituent quark structure for X nor that the strong hyperfine interaction is inversely proportional to quark masses. We only assume that the strong hyperfine interaction is greater in the (Xu) configuration than in the (Xd) configuration because $m_u < m_d$ and similarly for the $(Xu)^*$ and $(Xd)^*$ configurations.

It is convenient to define the generalized expression for the ratios appearing in eq. (1)

$$F(Q_X) \equiv \frac{\delta m(Xq) - \delta m[(Xq)^*]}{M[(Xq)^*] - M(Xq)} \quad (4)$$

The strong hyperfine interaction between X and q in the ground state (Xq) configuration is always attractive. It lowers $M(Xq)$ and lowers $M(Xu)$ more than it lowers $M(Xd)$. Thus the contribution of the strong hyperfine interaction to the ground state isospin mass splitting has *the same sign* as the mass difference contribution. In the excited $(Xq)^*$ configuration the strong hyperfine interaction between X and q is always repulsive. It raises $M[(Xq)^*]$ and raises $M[(Xu)^*]$ more than it raises $M[(Xd)^*]$. Thus the contribution of the strong hyperfine interaction to the excited state isospin mass splitting has *the opposite sign* to the mass difference contribution.

Thus

$$\delta_s m(Xq) - \delta_s m[(Xq)^*] \geq 0 \quad (5a)$$

where $\delta_s m$ denotes the strong contribution to the isospin splitting.

For $Q_X < 0$ and in particular for the case $Q_X = -2/3$ the coulomb and color electric interactions in the (Xu) configuration are both attractive; i.e. they both have the same sign. Therefore the corresponding magnetic interactions have the same sign. In the (Xd) configuration the signs of all electromagnetic interactions are opposite to those in (Xu). Thus the electromagnetic hyperfine contributions lower $M(Xu)$ and $M[(Xd)^*]$ while raising $M(Xd)$ and $M[(Xu)^*]$. Their contributions to the isospin splitting thus also satisfy the relation (5a). For $Q_X > 0$ and in particular for the case $Q_X = +1/3$ the electromagnetic contributions have the opposite sign from the case $Q_X = -2/3$. Their contributions therefore satisfy an inequality opposite to (5a). This can be expressed for the general case as

$$-Q_X \{\delta_e m(Xq) - \delta_e m[(Xq)^*]\} \geq 0 \quad (5b)$$

where $\delta_e m$ denotes the electromagnetic hyperfine contribution to the isospin splitting. We therefore find that for the case $Q_X < 0$ the total isospin splittings satisfy the inequality

$$\delta m(Xq) - \delta m[(Xq)^*] \geq 0 \text{ For } Q_X < 0 \quad (6a)$$

while the ratios $F(Q_X)$ defined by eq. (4) satisfy the inequality

$$0 \leq F(-2/3) \geq F(+1/3) \quad (6b)$$

These inequalities are satisfied by experiment.

We now derive the equalities (2) by introducing the following conventionally accepted additional assumptions;

1. Both the strong and electromagnetic contributions to the hyperfine splittings are given by the expectation value of the *same* operator, not necessarily the value of a wave function at the origin. They differ only in the values of the coefficients of this operator.
2. The strong hyperfine interaction operator factorizes into a factor depending only on light quark masses and independent of X and a factor depending upon the properties of X and independent of light quark masses. This factorization is found in the DGG model [5]. The quark masses used may be constituent quark masses, current quark masses or some kind of effective quark masses, all of which satisfy the inequality $m_u < m_d$.

We consider a “light quark symmetry” for states described as a single light quark moving through “heavy brown muck” containing no valence light quarks. We assume that the spin and isospin splittings can be treated by perturbation theory and therefore are expressible as expectation values of operators describing the perturbation all with the same unknown brown muck wave function. We use the Feynman-Hellmann theorem to express the first-order dependences of the hyperfine splittings on the mass and the charge of the light quark

as expectation values of the derivatives of an unknown operator with respect to the mass and charge of the light quark. We then find that unknown “brown muck” properties tend to cancel in the ratio of the isospin difference between hyperfine splittings to the total hyperfine splitting. The result is a universal mass formula for this ratio relating all hadrons in which the “brown muck” has the same electric charge.

Under the above assumptions the hyperfine mass splittings can be written

$$\Delta_{hyp}M(Xq) \equiv M[(Xq)^*] - M[(Xq)] = [S(m_q) - Q_X Q_q E(m_q)] \cdot \langle Xq | V(X) | Xq \rangle \quad (7)$$

where q denotes either u or d , $S(m_q)$ and $E(m_q)$ are constants depending on the value of the light quark mass m_q and independent of X , Q_q denotes the charge of the light quark q and the operator $V(X)$ denotes the hyperfine interaction which depends upon the properties of X but has its dependence on the flavor of the light quark q factored out and included in the coefficients. The constants $S(m_q)$ and $E(m_q)$ and the operator V are defined to make $S(m_q)$, $E(m_q)$ and $\langle Xq | V(X) | Xq \rangle$ all positive. This leads to the known positive value of the hyperfine splitting $M[(Xq)^*] - M[(Xq)]$ and is consistent with the observation that the color and electromagnetic couplings between X and q have the same sign, attractive, when $Q_X Q_q < 0$. Since the electromagnetic interaction is much weaker than the strong interaction; i.e. $\alpha \ll \alpha_{strong}$,

$$E(m_q) \ll S(m_q) \quad (8)$$

Then to first order in the small quantities $m_d - m_u$ and $E(m_q)/S(m_q)$, the Feynman-Hellmann theorem gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{hyp}M(Xd) - \Delta_{hyp}M(Xu) &= \\ &= \left[\left(\frac{\partial S(m_q)}{\partial m_q} + \xi S(m_q) \right) \cdot (m_d - m_u) + Q_X E(m_q) \right] \cdot \langle Xq | V(X) | Xq \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (9a)$$

where the parameter

$$\xi = \frac{\partial}{\partial m_q} \cdot \log \langle Xq | V(X) | Xq \rangle \quad (9b)$$

expresses the m_q dependence of $\langle Xq | V(X) | Xq \rangle$. The need for this correction is discussed and justified below. Thus

$$\frac{\Delta_{hyp}M(Xd) - \Delta_{hyp}M(Xu)}{\Delta_{hyp}M(Xd) + \Delta_{hyp}M(Xu)} = \frac{1}{2S(m_q)} \cdot \left[\left(\frac{\partial S(m_q)}{\partial m_q} + \xi S(m_q) \right) \cdot (m_d - m_u) + Q_X E(m_q) \right] \quad (9c)$$

When the wave function correction ξ is neglected the right hand side of eq. (9c) is seen to

depend upon the constituent X only via the electric charge Q_X and therefore has the same value for all constituents X having the same electric charge.

This result (9) can be expressed in a similar form with electromagnetic mass differences rather than hyperfine splittings. This gives the function $F(Q_X)$ defined by eq(4) as a universal function for all isospin differences between hyperfine splittings depending only on Q_X .

$$F(Q_X) = -\frac{1}{S(m_q)} \cdot \left(\frac{\partial S(m_q)}{\partial m_q} \cdot (m_d - m_u) + Q_X E(m_q) \right) - \xi \cdot (m_d - m_u) \quad (10)$$

When the correction term ξ is neglected eq. (1) is obtained for the case $Q_X = -2/3$ with $X = \bar{c}$ and $X = ss$. We can also include $X = bs$ and generalize eq. (1) to (2a). Eq. (2b) is obtained for the case $Q_X = +1/3$ with $X = \bar{s}$, $X = \bar{b}$ and $X = cs$.

We now examine the validity of the assumption used in obtaining the expression (7) for the hyperfine splittings which neglected any effect of the structure of the brown muck wave function X . We consider a constituent quark model in which X consists of two constituent heavy quarks denoted by x_1 and x_2 . Then we can write

$$\Delta_{hyp} M(x_1 x_2 q) \equiv M[(x_1 x_2 q)^*] - M[(x_1 x_2 q)] = \Delta_{hyp}^s M(x_1 x_2 q) + \Delta_{hyp}^e M(x_1 x_2 q) \quad (11)$$

where

$$\Delta_{hyp}^s M(x_1 x_2 q) = -s(m_q) \sum_{\alpha=1}^8 \langle x_1 x_2 q | g_\alpha(q) [g_\alpha(1)v(x_1) + g_\alpha(2)v(x_2)] | x_1 x_2 q \rangle \quad (12a)$$

$$\Delta_{hyp}^e M(x_1 x_2 q) = -Q_q E(m_q) \cdot \langle x_1 x_2 q | Q_1 v(x_1) + Q_2 v(x_2) | x_1 x_2 q \rangle \quad (12b)$$

$E(m_q)$ is the same as in eq. (7) and $s(m_q)$ is related to $S(m_q)$ by a color factor evaluated below. Both are constants depending on the value of the light quark mass m_q and independent of x_1 and x_2 . The operators $v(x_1)$ and $v(x_2)$ denote the hyperfine interaction at the constituent quark level which again has its dependence on the flavor of the light quark q factored out and included in the coefficients. The operators $g_\alpha(q)$, $g_\alpha(1)$ and $g_\alpha(2)$ denote the eight generators of $SU(3)_{color}$ acting on the particles q , x_1 and x_2 respectively. Eq. (12a) can be simplified by

using the $SU(3)_{color}$ identity valid for any three-quark color singlet state,

$$\langle x_1 x_2 q | g_\alpha(q) + g_\alpha(1) + g_\alpha(2) | x_1 x_2 q \rangle = 0 \quad (13a)$$

and noting that

$$C_3(q) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^8 [g_\alpha(q)]^2 = \sum_{\alpha=1}^8 [g_\alpha(1)]^2 = \sum_{\alpha=1}^8 [g_\alpha(2)]^2 \quad (13b)$$

is the Casimir operator of color SU(3) for a single quark or antiquark state. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{hyp}^s M(x_1 x_2 q) &= -(1/2)s(m_q) \sum_{\alpha=1}^8 \langle x_1 x_2 q | g_\alpha(q) [g_\alpha(1) + g_\alpha(2)] \cdot [v(x_1) + v(x_2)] | x_1 x_2 q \rangle + \Delta_s = \\ &= (1/2)s(m_q)C_3(q) \langle x_1 x_2 q | v(x_1) + v(x_2) | x_1 x_2 q \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (14a)$$

where

$$\Delta_s \equiv -(1/2)s(m_q) \sum_{\alpha=1}^8 \langle x_1 x_2 q | g_\alpha(q) [g_\alpha(1) - g_\alpha(2)] \cdot [v(x_1) - v(x_2)] | x_1 x_2 q \rangle = 0 \quad (14b)$$

$$\Delta_{hyp}^e M(x_1 x_2 q) = -(1/2)Q_q E(m_q) \cdot [(Q_1 + Q_2) \langle x_1 x_2 q | v(x_1) + v(x_2) | x_1 x_2 q \rangle + \Delta_e] \quad (15a)$$

where

$$\Delta_e \equiv -(1/2)Q_q E(m_q)(Q_1 - Q_2) \langle x_1 x_2 q | v(x_1) - v(x_2) | x_1 x_2 q \rangle \quad (15b)$$

Thus

$$\Delta_{hyp} M(x_1 x_2 q) = [S(m_q) - Q_X Q_q E(m_q)] \cdot \langle x_1 x_2 q | V(X) | x_1 x_2 q \rangle + \Delta_e \quad (16)$$

where

$$[S(m_q) = s(m_q)C_3(q)] \quad (17a)$$

$$V(X) = (1/2)[v(x_1) + v(x_2)] \quad (17b)$$

The hyperfine mass splittings for the three-constituent-quark system thus has the form of the “brown-muck” formulation (7) except for a correction term Δ_e which vanishes identically for the case $Q_1 = Q_2$ relevant to the expression (1) and can be expected to be small in the general case since the operator $v(x_1) - v(x_2)$ is antisymmetric in the particles 1 and 2 and has a vanishing expectation value for a symmetric wave function.

We can now also see how the relation (7) can break down for models more complicated than simple constituent quark models, where the internal structure of the “brown muck” state X effects the strong and electromagnetic couplings differently. The expressions (11-17) can be generalized to the case where the “brown muck” state X contains an arbitrary number of quarks and antiquarks and the result written in the form (16) with parameters Δ_e and Δ_s that vanish in some symmetry limit. However the symmetry limit is no longer relevant. There are quarks and antiquarks having different electric charges, and no simple permutation symmetry for interchanges of quarks and antiquarks.

We now show that the effect on the relation (1) of the correction term ξ in (10) is small in the approximation where $\langle Xq | V(X) | Xq \rangle$ depends upon m_q only via the reduced mass of the (Xq) system. This approximation is exact in a two-body nonrelativistic quark model and can be expected to be reasonably good in general. For simplicity we assume a power law dependence on the reduced mass. In this case we can write

$$\xi = -n \frac{\partial}{\partial m_q} \cdot \log \left(\frac{1}{m_q} + \frac{1}{m_X} \right) = \frac{n}{m_q} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{m_q}{m_q + m_X} \right) \quad (18a)$$

Then in the DGG model[5]

$$\xi + \frac{1}{S(m_q)} \cdot \left(\frac{\partial S(m_q)}{\partial m_q} \right) = \xi - \frac{1}{m_q} = \frac{n-1}{m_q} - \frac{n}{m_q + m_X} \quad (18b)$$

The correction term (18a) is seen to be comparable in magnitude to the dominant term, but depending strongly on the ratio $\frac{m_q}{m_q + m_X}$. When this ratio is unity; i.e. $m_X \ll m_q$ the correction term vanishes and all the good results of eq. (3) are obtained. When the ratio is small; i.e. $m_X \gg m_q$ the correction term tends to cancel the direct term and explain the failure of (3) for the charmed sector. We do not attempt here to carry this argument beyond hand waving. We consider only the relations (2), where the main correction is seen to be independent of m_X . We now show that the remaining correction is small. Since the expression $m_q + m_X$ is approximately equal to the mass of the hadron (Xq) , we can express the difference in the value of the function $F(Q_X)$ (4) for two hadron states denoted by A and B having the same value of Q_X as

$$F(Q_X)_B - F(Q_X)_A \approx \frac{n(M_A - M_B)}{M_A M_B} \cdot (m_d - m_u) \quad (19)$$

For the case of the D and Ξ hadrons of eq. (1) the correction to the strong contribution is $\approx 8\%$ if we take $n=1$ and $m_q = 360$ MeV and the correction to (1) is $\approx 4\%$ if the strong and electromagnetic contributions are roughly equal. The effect can be considerably larger in the comparison of the K and B systems. It will be interesting to check this experimentally.

We now return to the validity of the correction term ξ in eqs. (9-10) expressing the m_q dependence of the matrix element $\langle Xq|V(X)|Xq\rangle$. The Feynman-Hellmann theorem tells us to ignore wave function effects in first-order perturbation theory because all such effects cancel as a result of the variational principle. Therefore the first-order change in $\langle Xq|V(X)|Xq\rangle$ must be canceled by another contribution. This other contribution arises from the very small spin-dependent change in the wave function produced by a change in m_q because the wave function is an eigenfunction of the total Hamiltonian which includes the hyperfine interaction. This change in the wave function produces a *spin – dependent* energy change via the *spin – independent* part of the Hamiltonian; e.g. the kinetic energy. The Feynman-Hellmann theorem and the variational principle tell us that effects of this kind must exactly cancel the contribution to the energy from the change in $\langle Xq|V(X)|Xq\rangle$ to first order. This argument suggests that the correction term should not be introduced in eqs. (9-10).

However, there are really four independent matrix elements and two perturbations: the mass difference and the hyperfine interaction. We are calculating a second order cross term in a double perturbation series. The Feynman-Hellmann theorem cannot be used twice to justify using the same zero-order wave function in the same zero-order Hamiltonian for four matrix elements.

We now clarify this point explicitly and define a consistent perturbation calculation for the second order cross term. Consider a general hamiltonian having the form

$$H = T(m_q) + V + \frac{\epsilon}{m_q}V_{hyp} \quad (20)$$

where $T(m_q)$ is the kinetic energy of the light quark but can be generalized to include other contributions which depend upon m_q , V denotes all contributions to the Hamiltonian which do not depend explicitly on m_q , ϵ is a small parameter specifying the strength of the hyperfine interaction, all the explicit dependence of the hyperfine interaction on m_q is in the factor $\frac{1}{m_q}$, and the operator V_{hyp} contains no explicit dependence on m_q . We are interested in the dependence of $\langle H \rangle$ on m_q and ϵ to first order in the product $\epsilon \cdot \delta m_q$,

Using the Feynman-Hellmann theorem in two ways gives

$$\frac{\partial \langle H \rangle}{\partial \epsilon} = \frac{\langle V_{hyp} \rangle}{m_q} \quad (21a)$$

$$m_q \frac{\partial \langle H \rangle}{\partial m_q} = m_q \left\langle \frac{\partial T}{\partial m_q} \right\rangle - \frac{\epsilon}{m_q} \langle V_{hyp} \rangle \quad (21b)$$

where the variational principle as expressed by the Feynman-Hellmann theorem allows us not to consider the derivatives of the matrix elements. We now obtain the crossed second

derivative in two ways by direct differentiation of eqs. (21). Here there is no variational principle and the derivatives of the matrix elements must also be considered.

$$m_q \frac{\partial^2 \langle H \rangle}{\partial m_q \partial \epsilon} = -\frac{\langle V_{hyp} \rangle}{m_q} + \frac{\partial}{\partial m_q} \cdot \langle V_{hyp} \rangle \quad (22a)$$

$$m_q \frac{\partial^2 \langle H \rangle}{\partial \epsilon \partial m_q} = -\frac{\langle V_{hyp} \rangle}{m_q} + m_q \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \cdot \left\langle \frac{\partial T}{\partial m_q} \right\rangle \quad (22b)$$

These results (22a) and (22b) both give the same dominant term $-\frac{\langle V_{hyp} \rangle}{m_q}$ used in eqs. (9) when wave function effects are neglected. The result (22a) is just the full eq. (9) and justifies the use of the correction term (9b) for the change in the matrix element of the hyperfine interaction. Combining eqs. (22) gives

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial m_q} \cdot \langle V_{hyp} \rangle = m_q \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \cdot \left\langle \frac{\partial T}{\partial m_q} \right\rangle \quad (23)$$

This condition relating the mass dependence of the hyperfine matrix element and the effect of the hyperfine interaction on the kinetic energy seems at first very peculiar. But it must hold for any model described by the Hamiltonian (20) since it follows from calculating the same second derivative in two ways. It may be useful as a consistency check on detailed model calculations.

We now show how the variational principle relates kinetic and potential energies in the manner required by eq. (23) in the case of a nonrelativistic quark model and a short-range hyperfine interaction which can be written

$$\langle V_{hyp} \rangle = \int_0^{r_o} r^2 dr |\psi(r)|^2 v(r) \approx |\psi(0)|^2 \int_0^{r_o} r^2 dr v(r) \quad (24a)$$

$$\left\langle r \frac{dV_{hyp}}{dr} \right\rangle \approx |\psi(0)|^2 \int_0^{r_o} r^3 dr \frac{dv}{dr} = -|\psi(0)|^2 \int_0^{r_o} 3r^2 dr v(r) = -3\langle V_{hyp} \rangle \quad (24b)$$

where $\psi(0)$ denotes the wave function at the origin and $v(r)$ is a short range potential which vanishes for $r \geq r_o$ and we neglect the variation in the wave function for $r \leq r_o$. The virial

theorem gives

$$m_q \left\langle \frac{\partial T}{\partial m_q} \right\rangle = -\frac{\mu}{m_q} \cdot \langle T_{rel} \rangle = -\frac{\mu}{2m_q} \cdot \left\langle r \cdot \frac{dV}{dr} + \frac{\epsilon}{m_q} \cdot r \frac{dV_{hyp}}{dr} \right\rangle \quad (25)$$

where T_{rel} denotes the kinetic energy and μ the reduced mass of the relative motion in the (Xq) system. Substituting eqs. (24-25) into the condition (23) gives

$$\frac{\langle V_{hyp} \rangle}{|\psi(0)|^2} \cdot \frac{\partial(|\psi(0)|^2)}{\partial m_q} \approx \frac{3\mu}{2m_q^2} \cdot \langle V_{hyp} \rangle - \frac{\mu}{2m_q} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \cdot \left\langle r \cdot \frac{dV}{dr} \right\rangle \quad (26)$$

This condition must be satisfied in any nonrelativistic quark model with a short range hyperfine interaction and is seen by inspection to be satisfied for the case of a logarithmic potential model where $r \cdot \frac{dV}{dr}$ is a c-number independent of ϵ and $|\psi(0)|^2$ varies as $\mu^{(3/2)}$.

We thus conclude that the relation (1) is valid under very general assumptions going beyond the naive DGG model and that it is of interest to improve the precision of the mass measurements. The remaining relations (2) of this type are more sensitive to wave function effects but should still be approximately valid. The way in which wave function effects depending upon reduced mass can explain the paradox (3) is qualitatively indicated in eq. (18a). But a more quantitative explanation requires a more detailed model and probably a relativistic calculation.

Stimulating and clarifying discussions with Nathan Isgur and Jonathan L. Rosner and Sheldon Stone are gratefully acknowledged. This research was partially supported by the Basic Research Foundation administered by the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities and by grant No. 90-00342 from the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation (BSF), Jerusalem, Israel.

REFERENCES

1. Isaac Cohen and Harry J. Lipkin, Phys. Lett. B 84 (1979) 323.
2. CLEO Collaboration, D. Bortoletto *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69 (1992) 2046.
3. Particle Data Group, J. J. Hernández *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B 239 (1990) 1.
4. A. D. Sakharov, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 79(1980)350; Sov. Phys. JETP 52(1980)175..
5. A. De Rújula, H. Georgi, and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. D 12 (1975) 147.
6. James Amundson *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D 47 (1993) 3058.
7. Harry J. Lipkin, Phys. Lett. B 233 (1989) 446.
8. Nathan Isgur and Mark B. Wise, Phys. Lett. B 232 (1989) 113; B237 (1990) 527.